BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: April 3 and 10, 2008

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Joyce McKay, Sarah LeVaun Graulty, Kevin Nyhan, Marc Laurin, Bob Landry, Mark Richardson, Carol Niewola, Michael Pouliot, Angela Hubbard, Mike Dugas, Alex Vogt, Pete Salo, Jerry Zoller, Bob Juliano, NHDOT; Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson, Beth Muzzey, NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Rita Walsh, Pete Walker, Frank O'Callaghan, VHB; Tim Roache, Nashua Regional Planning Commission; Lynne Monroe, Carol Hooper, Preservation Company; Jamie Paine, John Byatt, CLD; David Cedarholm, Town of Durham; Jay Poulin, HEB; Diane Hanley, Laconia Trails with Rails Exploratory Committee; Bob Crichton, Somersworth Housing; Jeff Aleva, Civil Consultants; Kevin Gagne and Peter Howe, FST; Evan Detrick, Dubois & King, Inc.; Jeff Foote, Town of Bedford; Bob Klimm, PB; Jim Fisher, Addie Kim, HNTB Corporation

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

Nashua, NRBD-X-5315(021), 10040A
Claremont Municipal Airport (Bureau of Aeronautics)
Merrimack, 12105
Newington-Dover, NHS-027-1(37), 11238
Portsmouth, STP-X-5379(025), 13455
Durham, 14453
Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C
Laconia, X-A000(349), 14409
Portsmouth, BHF-T-0101(015), 13678
Somersworth, X-A000(359), 14419
Bennington, X-A000(341), 14401
Alexandria, 14964
Ellsworth, 14276
Bedford (no state or federal #)

Thursday, April 3, 2008

Nashua, NRBD-X-5315(021), 10040A. **Participants: Rita Walsh** (rwalsh@vhb.com)**, Pete Walker, Frank O'Callaghan, VHB; Tim Roache, Nashua Regional Planning Commission**

Frank O'Callaghan of VHB explained the changes to the proposed Broad Street Parkway project in Nashua. The purpose of this meeting with the agencies is to let them know about these changes and to gain any initial feedback and direction from the agencies.

The Broad Street Parkway was previously reviewed under NEPA with consultants FST, which resulted in a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in January 1997 and a FHWA Record of Decision (ROD) in March 1997. Since that time, the plan for the parkway alignment has been reviewed by Rizzo Associates, and most recently by VHB. VHB was contracted by the Nashua Regional Planning Commission in January 2007 to review the alignments and the environmental process required to go forward with a new alternative.

The 1997 selected alternative involved a new 4-lane parkway alignment through the southwestern section of the National Register-listed Nashua Manufacturing Company Historic District. This alignment required the removal of 4 buildings (Boiler House, Mill No. 5 annex, Picker Building, and a portion of and a 20th century garage) and the partial acquisition and removal of a section of Mill No. 6. Between 2001 and 2003, the Picker Building was removed; the other buildings proposed for demolition are still standing. A HAER report for the district and individual buildings by Lisa Mausolf under contract to Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST) was underway at this time but was not completed. FST closed their design contract with NHDOT just prior to VHB's involvement in the project, which began in early 2007.

The proposed new alternative is a 2-lane alignment parallel but further east of the selected alternative that is much less costly to build than the selected alternative. The proposed new alternative is on Pine Street and an extension north over the canal to new roadway already planned within the selected alternative. The proposed new alternative affects the north end of the Storehouse #2 (#13 in National Register nomination), the Waste House (#15 in the National Register nomination), and the Power Canal (#11 in National Register nomination) through the removal of the north end of Storehouse #2 and the entirety of the Waste House and an intersection with the Power Canal (it was noted that the penstock at the north end of the canal where this new alternative crosses was rebuilt in the 1970s). However, the proposed new alternative means that the Mill No. 5 annex and garage will remain. The Boiler House would still be removed for the Spine Road east-west connection from the Parkway.

Beth Muzzey expressed her concern about a new roadway engineering structure (albeit 2-lane) in the middle of the historic district. She asked that a written summary describing and comparing the effects of the alternatives be submitted for agency review. She also requested the new Purpose and Need statement, to show that the need is still relevant.

Once the agencies receive this information, they can then make a more formal opinion on what needs to be done and their judgment on the new alternative. She also asked whether there were federal funds used to remove the Picker Building. She noted that it appears that the currently proposed project is enlarging a road (Pine Street) to something it never was, which could create a significant impact within the district. B. Muzzey also stated that moving Pine Street extension to the east would help with the currently proposed level of impacts.

The entire corridor also needs to be re-examined to determine if any new properties should be reviewed for their National Register eligibility given the fact that over 10 years has elapsed since the initial survey. The role of consulting parties has also been expanded since the initial consultation and needs to be re-addressed.

The HAER study needs to be completed for this project. Joyce McKay noted that Lisa Mausolf was not completely paid for this work and that $4,000 is due to her by FST.

VHB acknowledged that, if the project moves forward, the City would need to prepare the written summaries of the alternatives and to submit these summaries with maps and photographs as well as a revised discussion of any revision to the Purpose and Need statement.

Claremont Municipal Airport (Bureau of Aeronautics). Participants: Carol Niewola and Michael Pouliot, Bureau of Aeronautics.

Ms. Carol Niewola provided a summary of the proposed taxiway construction project. She explained that in FY 2008 the plan is to construct the easterly portion of Taxiway 'C,' which will be parallel to Runway 11-29, with the westerly portion to be constructed at a later date. As part of the E.O. 12372 Intergovernmental Review Process to receive federal funding assistance for this project, the airport sponsor through their consultant forwarded a request to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) along with supporting information for review of this project in terms compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The SHPO put forth a response letter on March 18, 2008 that states,

> "Although there are no known sites identified or recorded within or adjacent to the proposed project area, the area does exhibit archaeological sensitivity…. Archaeological sites have been identified in similar landforms."
> "…surveys are required and they are not considered optional [to meet Section 106 review requirements]."
> "If …the State Historic Preservation Office considers the area potentially sensitive for cultural resources, it is then the responsibility of the project proponent to continue the identification process."

Ms. Edna Feighner said that this letter was drafted this way because there wasn't enough data in the request letter to make a determination. Therefore, the purpose of this meeting

was to provide the additional documentation needed by the SHPO to make a determination for further study.

Ms. Niewola explained that the airport was originally built in 1927 with wide (approximately 300 feet) turf runways; a 1927 USGS map of the area and black and white photographs from the 1930s were presented for review. In the early 1940s, the U.S. Navy took over the airport and used it as a training facility for their naval aviators. At that time, the Navy paved two runways where the turf runways were and graded 250 feet on either side of each runway centerline to meet airport design standards that were in place at that time. The centerline of the new parallel taxiway will be located 240 feet from the centerline of the east-west runway (a.k.a. Runway 11-29), which is within the grading that the Navy did.

The airport conducted two airport master planning efforts: one in 1981 and one in 1998. The 1981 report included a letter from the SHPO that noted no areas of significance existed at the airport. The ultimate plan for the airport included this same parallel taxiway. The 1998 report included only reference to coordination with the SHPO for review of the ultimate airport development, again including the same parallel taxiway. The report stated that except for a Greek Revival house located on private property to the east of the airport and slated, at that time, for acquisition and demolition to protect airspace to the approach to the runway, the SHPO state that "other proposed airport-improvement projects do not appear to impact historic, architectural, archaeological, or cultural resources in the vicinity of the airport." Ms. Niewola stated that the airport's consultant is working to find the referenced communication, but had not found it yet.

Ms. Feighner said that if the SHPO had reviewed the ultimate airport development plan and had come to that conclusion, then there would be no need for additional surveys of the site required for this taxiway project. Ms. Feighner said that a copy of that letter would be located in the SHPO's files and sent to NHDOT to complete their documentation for this project. This letter, together with the minutes from this coordination meeting, would be all that is needed to fulfill the requirements of the SHPO's March 18, 2008 letter on this subject. If the letter is not found, a No Historic Properties Affected letter would have to be prepared.

Ms. Feighner recommended that in the future, Section 106 determinations be finalized before any soil test pits for project design are dug within a project area as was done in this instance. Such soil testing would have destroyed any archaeological resources if they had been present in the area.

Merrimack 12105 (no federal #). Participants: Marc Laurin, Angela Hubbard, and Mark Richardson.

A. Hubbard stated that, as previously determined, the project impacts to the Merrill's Marauders Bridge created an adverse effect and the requested documentation was completed. She briefly described the necessary rehabilitation that needs to be done and

the widening of the bridge to the west required for traffic control. It has been subsequently determined that the existing outside girder, which presently supports only the southbound shoulder, will not meet the design loading that will occur when traffic is shifted onto the widened portion. As such, the girder will need to be replaced. M. Richardson stated that if the girder were to remain, differential settlement would occur and cause cracking of the bridge deck. A. Hubbard pointed out that even though the east-most girder is also substandard, it will continue to support the northbound shoulder (even if the Turnpike is widened to 3 lanes in each direction) and will not see any traffic loading. Consequently, it does not need to be replaced and eleven original girders will remain after completion of the project. E. Muzzey inquired about the beam being sistered, M. Richardson replied that it would be extremely difficult and not practicable. E. Muzzey stated that the impacts would result in a Section 106 Adverse Effect. No further mitigation would be required, though an MOA will need to be developed that would include how the Department tried to avoid the impacts to the bridge.

Newington-Dover, NHS-027-1(37), 11238. Participant: Marc Laurin.

J. McKay and M. Laurin briefed E. Muzzey on the project impacts and mitigation commitments that were developed in consultation with DHR during the EIS process. The MOA was signed by the SHPO, FHWA and DOT.

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C. Participants: Marc Laurin, and Pete Salo.

P. Salo summarized previously discussed concept regarding the Department proposal to replace the existing M&L Rail corridor stone box culvert thinking that this would avoid conflicts with the AT&T cable that runs along the corridor. Subsequently, it was determined that there would still be conflicts with the cable if the new culvert were replaced in the old culvert location. Also, further consultation with AT&T determined that the involvement with the cable would not be as costly and time-consuming as previously anticipated since a parallel conduit is available that can be used to replace the cable. Therefore, the Department is proposing the construction of the new 2 ½ foot by 8 foot, precast concrete box culvert approximately 40 feet to the west of the existing and rerouting the flows away from the stone box culvert. The stone culvert will remain as a dry culvert.

E. Muzzey asked why the existing box culvert could not handle the flows. P. Salo stated that due to reconfiguration in the Exit 5 interchange area, increased flows will be directed to the culvert area and would have resulted in backwater flooding adjacent properties if a wider structure were not constructed. E. Muzzey stated that the proposed work would be a No Adverse Effect on the M&L corridor (if the line or this portion is determined eligible) and agreed that there is no longer a need to individually document the culvert. The culvert will need to be in the on-going inventory of the M&L corridor.

Portsmouth, STP-X-5379(025), 13455. Participants: Marc Laurin, Alex Vogt, and Mike Dugas; Bob Klimm, PB; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Co.

M. Dugas summarized the revised project scope of work. The proposed rehabilitation of the Route 1 Bypass has been reduced and will now only entail the removal of six red-listed bridges along the Bypass. Five will be replaced on existing alignment. The railroad bridge over the Bypass will not be replaced. The overpass at the US 1 interchange will not be replaced, rather a signalized, at-grade intersection of US 1 with the Bypass will be constructed.

A review and discussion of the impacts to the potential individually eligible properties, and the Hillside Drive, Middle Road, Islington-Melbourne, Christian Shores, and Route 1 Bypass historic districts affected by the project was conducted. The following table summarizes the determinations made. Note that for all properties in districts any impacts will be viewed as an impacts to the district rather than to the contributing property.

NHDHR#	Parcel(s)#	Description	Impacts / Effects Determination
POR0038	19	William Langdon House	Driveway slope impacts / No Adverse Effect
POR0040	20	John W. Hopley House	Minor driveway slope impacts / No Adverse Effect
POR0046	27	Capt Banfield/ Samuel Langdon House	Minor driveway slope impacts / No Adverse Effect as long as mature trees and historic landscape features are not impacted
Area HS		Hillside Drive District	Greenleaf Avenue relocation / No Adverse Effect (District Boundary to be readjusted)
	26 & 29	Contributing properties	Greenleaf Ave relocated away from properties, driveways lengthened / No Adverse Effect
Area MR		Middle Road District	Minor driveway slope impacts / No Adverse Effect
POR0055	69	Contributing property	Minor driveway slope impacts / No Adverse Effect as long as mature tree is not impacted, either by design or secondary construction impacts
Area IM		Islington-Melbourne District	Minor driveway and sidewalk slope impacts / No Adverse Effect
	Parcels 96 and 100. Also #1200 and #1202 Islington Rd (street addresses)	Contributing properties	Minor driveway and sidewalk slope impacts / No Adverse Effect as long as no mature trees or historic landscape

			features are impacted
Area CH		Christian Shore District	Slope impacts & retaining wall / *More Info on Impacts needed* (Determine identity of cistern-like feature.)
POR0100	193	Seely House	Slope impacts & retaining wall / *More Info on Impacts needed*
POR0120	191	Cutts Mansion	Slope impacts from adjacent property driveway / No Adverse Effect as long as landscaping elements are not impacted.
Area RT1BYP		US 1 Bypass District	Removal of 6 bridges (5 replaced), reconstruction of associated roadway & reconfiguration of US 1 junction with Bypass / add signal Adverse Effect

The visual impacts caused by landscaping changes to the above properties will be reviewed at the May cultural resources meetings. L. Monroe was asked to take additional photographs to enable this review. Also, the south end of the district should be clearly defined.

A discussion of the potential mitigation requirements ensued. E. Muzzey stated that a discussion of options and alternatives would be needed. J. Sikora stated that this would also be required for the 4(f) documentation. Such options would include repair, replace, bypassing bridge, and no action. L. Wilson suggested that the information gathered be posted on-line and that it would be beneficial if it were recognized nationwide as an early example of an interstate. Regarding the HAER documentation of the bridges, since they are all similar except for Woodbury Ave, it was agreed that the similar ones should be documented together with the focus on the best representative example for the detailed description. The Woodbury Avenue Bridge would be documented separately. HAER should be contacted to see if this documentation would be appropriate to their needs. The opportunity to provide a state historic highway marker at the Liquor Store or in the area of the proposed at-grade intersection of Route 1 with the Bypass was discussed. A MOA will be developed and mitigation further detailed in the environmental documentation.

Durham, 14453 (no federal #). Participants: Jamie Paine and John Byatt (johnb@cldengineers.com), CLD; David Cedarholm, Town of Durham.

Jamie Paine and John Byatt from CLD Consulting Engineers and David Cedarholm from the Town of Durham represented the proposed project for the Town of Durham. The proposed project replaces the two adjacent single lane bridges (070/072 and 069/072) that carry Wiswall Road over the Lamprey River in Durham with a single, pre-cast concrete bridge, raises the elevation of the exiting bridges over the 100-year flood mark, eliminates the center island or pier, and increases the load capacity of the crossing.

The bridges were overtopped during Spring 2006 storms, and a temporary bridge currently serves the area. The project is being funded using NHDOT Bridge-Aid monies, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and town monies.

Background Information
This project was previously presented at the September 13, 2007 Cultural Resources Meeting. A project area form was completed by Preservation Company that would determine the existence of a historic district in the project area associated with the National Register-listed Wiswall Mill Site. The project area form would also provided a history of the bridge crossing. The NHDHR also stated that a public meeting would be required to allow the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed plans with the full knowledge of the historic findings. B. Muzzey asked whether the raising of the bridge would have a visual impact on the district. The bottom of the proposed bridge is 1.5 feet higher than the exsiting bridges. There will also be a retaining wall.

Historic Findings
Based on the report and concurrence from NHDHR, a historic district was found to cover a majority of the project area, minus the very western extent of roadway approaches. It was also confirmed that the bridge abutments and pier contribute to the historic district.

Public Meeting/Input Received
Per NHDHR's direction, a public meeting, which was also aired to the general public on local cable television, was held at the Durham Town Hall on Wednesday, March 19, 2008. Approximately 20-25 people were in attendance, including many residents who live on Wiswall Road and other areas of town. At that meeting, proposed design plans were discussed and previous alternatives that were investigated were mentioned. The findings of the historic district area form were explained in detail. Due to the specific direction received from NHDHR that input from the general public was a key factor in the acceptance of impacts to any potentially historic resource, the specific question was asked of those in attendance regarding their concerns with the complete removal of the abutments and pier and re-use of their stone materials on site for slope stabilization. By a show of hands, the clear majority stated that they had no concerns with the complete removal of the bridge structure and re-use of materials on site.

NHDHR Determination

If the lead federal agency on this project is FEMA, NHDHR noted that the agency needs to review the proposed plan and provide formal comment on the project. It was asked if NH Office of Emergency Management, the State Liaison for projects receiving FEMA monies, had been contacted. It was explained that numerous attempts have been made to contact NHOEM's primary contact, Ms. Tammy Vallaincourt, however, all attempts to date have been futile and frustrating for the Town, as no calls have been returned. As with each project, NHDHR stated that avoidance of the structure needs to be considered. If the historic resource cannot be avoided, then minimization of impacts needs to be examined. If impacts cannot be reduced, then mitigation would be considered. The agreed measures to minimize harm and mitigation would be documented in a MOA.

Ms. Feighner mentioned that covering over the abutment or entombing them may be a consideration. The town and CLD explained that numerous design considerations have been reviewed, but budgetary constraints are a major limiting factor. The existing abutments have been compromised for long-term stability. Entombing of the abutments may not solve the stability concerns and could potentially pose a serious liability issue for the Town of Durham.

It was stated that a meeting would be held between all pertinent federal agencies, NHDHR, the town, and CLD to confirm involvement of all parties and to develop a resolution of issues. The relative federal agencies include: FEMA, US Army Corps of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the National Park Service. (*Note that an initial meeting of this group [minus the ACOE and NH Office of Emergency Management] was held on Thursday, April 17, 2008 at the project site. FEMA has assigned a cultural resources specialist to the project. No further substantial action has occurred to date).*

Thursday, April 10, 2008

Laconia, X-A000(349), 14409. Participants: Jay Poulin (jpoulin@hebcivil.com), HEB; Diane Hanley, Laconia Trails with Rails Exploratory Committee.

Jay Poulin opened the meeting with a brief introduction of the project and current status of the design and permitting. The project involves the design and construction of a shared use path for bicycles and pedestrians through the City of Laconia. This is primarily a rail with trail project following the Plymouth and Lincoln Railroad (also the Boston, Concord and Montreal, an eligible line) in Laconia. The pathway, when complete, will be approximately 9 miles in length and run from the Belmont Town Line to the Meredith Town Line. Phase 1 includes the area from Main St. to Elm Street in Laconia. Total path length for Phase 1 is approx. 7,400'. Of that, approximately 2000' follows Messer Street.

J. Poulin noted the railroad corridor is owned by State of New Hampshire. The only operating rail service on the Laconia segment is the Hobo Railroad of Lincoln which is a slow-speed, seasonal train service. The project is a joint venture between the Laconia Trails with Rails Exploratory Committee (LTREC) and the City of Laconia.

J. Poulin noted that this project was before this group back on 2/8/07 for a conceptual review as the alignment and details had yet to be finalized. At the 2/8/07 meeting, it was recommended that a Phase IA archeological review be conducted for the rail corridor to identify any sensitivity. Subsequent to that meeting, the City of Laconia engaged Victoria Bunker to complete a Phase IA assessment within the project limits. A copy of the report was given to Edna Feighner and Joyce McKay at the 4/10/08 meeting. The report indicates no sensitivity along the project corridor. E. Feighner did indicate that she will need to review the report prior to her comments on archaeological sensitivity.

A finding of No Adverse Effect was found for the project, and HEB was asked to fill out and return a Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect. Should E. Feighner concur with the results of the Phase IA report and based on discussion at the 4/10/08 meeting, no impact to archaeological properties will occur as part of this project. If archaeological sensitivity is found, then the memo would need to indicate that all necessary phases of archaeological investigations would be completed.

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958. Participant: J. McKay

J. McKay confirmed the current survey strategies for the Berlin Heights District. B. Muzzey had previously suggested that continuation sheets be prepared for each impacted property with the following information: property description, background history, statement of significance for contribution to the district, and integrity. Additionally, the district boundary will be drawn, described, and justified. The later will be accompanied with a table indicating whether the properties are contributing or noncontributing. B. Muzzey also requested that Preservation Company prepare an alternatives analysis for the two alternatives, which would compare the nature of the impacts on the district by the two alternatives. The analysis would not only address the number of impacts but the nature of those impacts.

Portsmouth, BHF-T-0101(015), 13678. Participants: Bob Landry, Kevin Nyhan, Bob Juliano, Jerry Zoller, NHDOT; Lynne Monroe, Carol Hooper, Preservation Company; Jim Fisher, Addie Kim (akim@hntb.com)**, HNTB Corporation.**

The purpose of this meeting was to present the final design for the various components of the Memorial Bridge and to review the status of cultural resource assessments/mitigation.

Jim Fisher presented an overview of the proposed Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation Project that will include "modified in-kind replacement" of the lift span (replacing the verticals, diagonals, cross bracing and sway bracing), complete replacement of the Scott Avenue Bridge, and minor rehabilitation of the Kittery approach spans.

The design of the architectural components of the project has been performed to address historic considerations (see attached copy of the presentation). The materials proposed

for use in the design of the control house, machinery house, gate tender/storage houses consist of copper treated to achieve a weathered, green patina. The original machinery house was modified and extended in 1981 to raise the roof of the structure so that it extends higher than the top of the upper chord of the bridge. The proposed machinery house would be expanded on all sides, but would be designed to conform to the elevation of the bridge and would not extent above the upper chord.

Jim Fisher presented renderings of the buildings. He indicated that the control house would be relocated as a separate structure within the south tower and would incorporate work stations, running water and sewer, and locker rooms for several shifts of workers. He indicated that the control house has been designed to incorporate glass for increased visibility for the operators. Jim Fisher pointed out that the rendering shows enclosures for the droop cables and the stairs that would incorporate fencing.

Elizabeth Muzzey inquired why a fence is incorporated into the stairs. Jim Fisher replied that this was for security purposes.

Jim Fisher reviewed the configuration of the two gatehouses and two storage houses, which will be cantilevered to free up room on the sidewalks. The storage houses would be located opposite from the gatehouses on each approach. The houses would be made of the same copper material with the green patina and would also incorporate glass to maximize views for the gate tenders. Use of glass for these structures would make the operators more visible from the sidewalks.

Jim Fisher indicated that the sidewalk surface would be constructed of recycled polyethylene planks that would be manufactured to replicate the existing wood planking on the sidewalks. He indicated that this is a very durable product.

Elizabeth Muzzey inquired whether this has been used on bridges before. Jim Fisher confirmed that this product has been used on other bridges. Jerry Zoller inquired whether Trex is proposed to be used. Jim Fisher commented that this is one of the types of products that could be used. Jerry Zoller indicated that this material was used on the Newcastle Bridge around the corner.

Jim Fisher discussed the railings and indicated that the diameter of the posts would be maintained at 3-4 inches, with a 10-foot post spacing and 3-foot, 6-inch height.

Elizabeth Muzzey inquired what the difference was on the railings. It was stated that there is a small difference and that the proposed railing has been designed to mimic what's there today. The proposed railing meets code for the less than six-inch opening between railing posts (small enough to prevent a child from inserting his head).

Jim Fisher indicated that modifications would be made to 45% of the fixed truss members for rehabilitation that is intended to strengthen the structure to carry the additional weight of the new lift span and arrest deterioration. Lower chord retrofits are only for deterioration. Jim Fisher presented drawings showing locations of the retrofits on the

south truss span and north truss span, which will not affect the top chord. Joyce McKay inquired what these would look like. Jim Fisher presented a photo/detail of typical vertical and diagonal retrofits that will involve adding plates, sandblasting to bare steel, adding new steel, and then applying the final paint coat. On the diagonals, they would be replacing the gusset plates.

Jim Fisher indicated that the tower retrofits involved replacement of all sheave support truss members (framing) at the top of the tower for the new assembly. Strengthening to support the added weight of the new lift span would affect 40% of the front tower columns.

Jim Fisher noted that the truss span deck would be replaced to address corrosion underneath. This would involve installation of new planking on the sidewalks and replacement of vertical gusset plates on the lower chord. Stringer/floor beam repairs would also be performed underneath the deck.

Jim Fisher indicated that the proposed Scott Avenue Bridge design would open up the area under the bridge and along the waterfront, by eliminating pier columns. The current construction schedule calls for 27 months of construction over two seasons. During the first construction season, rehabilitation of the two fixed spans would involve a one-lane detour. During the second season, the Memorial Bridge lift span and Scott Avenue Bridge would be replaced over a 5 ½ month period.

Elizabeth Muzzey inquired whether the work would involve a change to existing roadways for the detours. Bob Landry indicated that the detour would direct traffic to I-95, not the Sarah Long Bridge. Bob Juliano indicated that, due to the current weight restriction on the Memorial Bridge, an overweight truck detour is currently in place that directs traffic to I-95.

The status of the Historic Structures Report was discussed. Preservation Company indicated that they thought that, at a minimum, Jim Garvin/NH DHR might want to review the character-defining table. Elizabeth Muzzy indicated that she would check with Jim Garvin on this. Updated final design plans and final production details are in process of being incorporated. There would be a place-saver in the report for the photos for the float-in/float-out of the lift span that can be insert into each copy of the report at a later date.

Elizabeth Muzzey inquired about having the report available in *.pdf format, including large-scale photos and historic photos. Joyce McKay indicated that copies would be given to most of the historical societies in the area. Kevin Nyhan indicated that there would be no problem finding a location for the report on the NHDOT website. It was discussed that there may be public interest in the report during construction, and that the City of Portsmouth website might also be another possibility. Addie Kim inquired whether the photos had to be high resolution. Preservation Company indicated that the file sizes are large due to the numbers of photographs. Bob Landry indicated that the file sizes should be easily downloadable and not necessarily high-resolution images. Linda

Wilson indicated that the state library might be another depository for a large document to reside for public viewing. It was agreed that the document would be produced in *.pdf format for web site posting during construction.

Addie Kim presented the lighting that was agreed upon with the City of Portsmouth. It was discussed the NH DHR had originally deferred to the city for the lighting style, and the city had initially indicated a preference for the original acorn style lighting for the Scott Avenue Bridge approach. A similar style of lighting is in Prescott Park. In further discussions with the city, they indicated a preference to have the lighting on the Scott Avenue bridge and the Memorial bridge match and chose the luminaries design (acorn-type lighting) as seen in Prescott Park.

Addie Kim indicated that Kent Severson, a bronze conservator who was recommended by the National Park Service, performed an inspection of the plaques on March 11, 2008. The inspection was followed by a site visit with Jim Garvin, Joyce McKay, and Sarah Graulty to come to agreement on the proposed approach for treatment/conservation of the plaques. The bronze conservator indicated that the overhead plaque is in good shape and has never been blast cleaned, and there remains evidence of the original gilding on the letters. This plaque (Plaque 1), the eagle statuary, and the two plaques mounted on each of the truss approach members (Plaques 2 and 3), and the Memorial Park Plaque (Plaque 5) are made of bronze. The lift span plaque commemorating Wadell (Plaque 4) is made of iron. As directed by NH DHR, this will be mounted on the closest fixed span truss member after the lift span is replaced.

Addie Kim indicated that in the March 11 meeting general consensus for the approach to cleaning the plaques with medium high-pressure wash and to treat the bronze with Incralac. The iron plaque would be painted. The granite plinth in Memorial Park will be removed and replaced after construction, and the plaque reinstalled into the plinth. The engineers have determined, working with Bob Landry, that drainage issues will be handled by installing gravel under the granite plinth, which is one of the suggestions that Kent had to improve drainage. The report and specifications prepared by Kent Severson will be incorporated into the construction contract specifications, and the photos that he took will be made an attachment to his report. Elizabeth Muzzey questioned whether Kent Severson would continue to be involved during construction. Addie Kim responded that his recommendations for use of conservators on the contractor's team would be incorporated into the contract documents, and the HNTB construction services team would include Kent Severson, as he is available, or other qualified conservator to oversee the contractor's work.

Joyce McKay questioned whether the Memorial Park plinth would be placed in the original location. Addie Kim indicated that a provision would be made in the specifications for the plinth to be placed either in the original location or as directed by the Engineer. Bob Landry clarified that this should be at the direction of the Contract Administrator. Joyce McKay also clarified that this should be revised to state, "in the original location or as directed by the Contract Administrator, in consultation with J. McKay and NHDHR."

Addie Kim indicated that the structural engineers are recommending that all fasteners for the plaques be replaced with new stainless steel fasteners. Elizabeth Muzzey inquired whether the original fasteners were bronze. Addie Kim indicated that the conservator's report covered materials and the conservator recommends that those that are visible from the ground be replaced with bronze, but recommendations need to be reviewed with the structural engineers. There will also be other separators to minimize electrolytic actions, but the team is working out the details as to which materials would be used.

Addie Kim indicated that the specs would require that the contractor submit an erection diagram prepared by a qualified structural engineer to mount and reattach the plaques. The eagle was reported to weight 1,100 pounds, and there are two plates that form a V-shaped trough under the large overhead plaque. These plates conceal other structural elements that may be holding the plaque in place. This trough was reportedly filled with bird droppings, and there are small trees growing out of it.

Addie Kim indicated that the issue of paint colors on the bridge was originally discussed with NH DHR, who deferred to the city's preferences. Research by Preservation Company has indicated that the bridge was most likely originally painted black. In meetings with the city of Portsmouth, city staff indicated a preference for a black railing. Bob Landry indicated that there are no plans to paint the Kittery approach, but the railing will be replaced throughout the entire structure. He indicated that the bridge could be left green, and the railing painted black. Bob Landry also indicated that there are unresolved issues regarding the need to install a crashworthy barrier on the Maine approach span. FHWA and MaineDOT are reviewing this issue, and any changes would be brought before NH DHR. Addie Kim indicated that the green bridge with black railing was the proposal presented to NH DHR last year, but after the meeting, the consensus from NH DHR was to paint the bridge all green. Elizabeth Muzzey requested a copy of last year's presentation. Jim Fisher presented the rendering from last year's presentation showing the black railing, and Addie Kim indicated that HNTB would also send a *.pdf. Elizabeth Muzzey inquired about the colors on the Scott Avenue Bridge. Bob Landry indicated that the railing and lighting would be painted black, but the remainder of the bridge would be green. Elizabeth Muzzey indicated that she would confer with Jim Garvin to confirm that NH DHR's preference was for all green on the Memorial Bridge. Addie Kim indicated that input on paint colors would also be obtained in a public meeting scheduled for the end of May.

Addie Kim indicated that archaeological monitoring would be performed for all construction excavations along the shoreline, all excavations below 4 feet in depth in Memorial Park, and all excavations in Wright Avenue. Jim Fisher indicated that he has alerted the archaeologists that monitoring may need to occur throughout the night to meet the construction schedule. Joyce McKay indicated that, if this is the case, the contractor would need to provide bright nighttime lighting that to illuminate the excavation areas. The issue of safely trenching to permit access by the archaeologists was also raised. Jim Fisher indicated that these issues would be addressed further.

Addie Kim indicated that the interpretive historic sign was developed in draft format for

comment. Addie Kim indicated that the city of Portsmouth expects to develop a standard sign format in the future, at which point all signs in the city would be taken down and manufactured to be consistent with the new format. In the absence of such a format, the format suggested by the city follows the city's format for the Point of Graves sign that is 24 inches wide and 18 inches high. The city has also expressed a preference for the same color schemes on the sign (red lettering and gray background). Addie Kim indicated that the sample formats developed in advance of content development followed the city's format, and the format originally called for three equally sized photos. Addie Kim indicated that the city has indicated that it approves of the draft sign design. Joyce McKay stated that the format and size of photos and arrangement of text on the sign needs to reflect the relative importance of the information for the interpretation of the bridge. Addie Kim suggested that eliminating the drawing of the lift span, which might be too detailed for presentation at 4" x 6" size, might help to balance the sign and would also offset the map. Elizabeth Muzzey also questioned whether the lift span drawing needed to be included, since there is a photo of the lift span. Several commentators also questioned whether the map needed to be included in the sign. Linda Wilson suggested that maybe a sketch or diagram could replace the map. There was a consensus that a photo of the float-in and float-out of the lift span should be included on the sign, and a decision was made to table the design of the sign until later during construction, at which time the city may have established the new format for its sign program. Joyce McKay suggested that a graphics company could be subcontracted through Preservation Company. Jim Fisher indicated that this would be incorporated into the Construction Services scope. Bob Landry indicated that the historic sign could be one of the last items to be installed by the contractor.

Somersworth, X-A000(359), 14419. Participants: Bob Crichton, Somersworth Housing and Geoffrey R. Aleva (geoff@civcon.com), Civil Consultants.

G. Aleva (GRA) started discussion of project without realizing that the project would need to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for rehabilitation. J. Garvin indicated that they were relatively general, but needed to be followed. G. Aleva presented the plans to the group and asked for questions. The following list of items was discussed and will be addressed prior to returning for further review.

- Masonry Pointing: The plans and specs will be updated to reflect that the qualifications of the mason who will have a demonstrated experience for working on historic buildings. J. Garvin will send a list of qualified masons. The mason will also be directed to inspect and test the existing mortar for hardness as they progress around the building. Both mortar hardness and color should match the original in hardness and color. Areas that require pointing will be noted on the plans. It is important to note that Civil Consultants will be on site for construction review.

- The brick cleaning method will be better specified on the plans. This will include maximum water pressure allowable. The specs need to specify a low pressure and non-detergent (non-ionic solution) cleaning.

- Window Replacement: We will conduct a window survey to determine the age and condition of the original windows and determine whether they can be renovated and replaced in-kind as requested by DHR. This information should be related to the DHR prior to making a decision about replacement. If replacement windows need to be used because of poor condition, they will be all wood to follow the Secretary's Standards. The issue of vinyl exteriors on the windows will need to be resolved at the next meeting. G. Aleva is to bring a sample to the next meeting. The windows will have wood interior, painted to match existing. The windows will be energy star rated will low e-glass. The windows will not be vinyl "replacement" style but will be architectural high quality windows made for new construction. If vinyl exterior windows are not acceptable, we will use wood exteriors. The vinyl is preferred due to minimal long-term maintenance requirements. We are looking for exterior colors to be dark green colors.

- Door specifications will be updated. It is anticipated that the 1970s/1980s street level doors will be replaced with solid wood and glass doors. The basement or railroad level existing doors will be removed and repainted.

- All copper and slate will be stockpiled on site for potential reuse. Copper from the gutters and down spouts shall be the property of the owner and stored in a lockable container. The rehabilitation will use copper gutters as well. It is assumed that if possible, portions of the existing slate will be reused and augmented with new slate as needed. Fasteners on the slate roof should be copper.

- Interior Bathroom Revisions: The plans will be revised to indicate the proper door clearances if possible. The owner may need to apply for a variance due to the existing conditions. The details will be updated to reflect the access dimensions for the fixtures. The present plans indicated solid lines where dashed lines should have been placed. The basement level men's room will be adjusted to show the relocated urinal.

Civil Consultants will attempt to have these changes completed prior to the next meeting May 8, 2008. The city plans to start the project this summer.

NHDHR will send over a list of window experts that we may choose to review the structure.

Bennington, X-A000(341), 14401. Kevin Gagne (kgagne@fstinc.com) and Peter Howe, FST, and Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company

Kevin Gagne provided a brief update of the project status in this eligible district (project is currently in Preliminary Design review at NHDOT) including primary changes that have occurred since the 1/15/08 meeting. A color project plan indicating contributing resources and impacts was presented. A handout was provided with photographs of impact areas, which were keyed to the plan. Key impacts were reviewed in the following areas:

Library:
- Miscellaneous driveway paving work
- One-foot impact due to shifted sidewalk, granite back-curb needed
- Walk repair leading to building; reduces existing slope, railing may not be necessary

Monument island: no change in location of water trough/monument
Schnare property: corner safety improvement, adjust fence segment angle, remove and reset existing fence for protection
Town Hall: granite steps would be preferred at small stairway near crosswalk. The intent is to increase green space in front of the town hall and decrease parking.
Fire Station: Greenspace expansion near fire station. Red maples may be planted. Fire station driveway match and overhead door maintained
"Oldest house" in Bennington on Cross St.: Stone wall and steps to remain, although steps may need to be reset, and back curb for grades
Tire Store: Drainage will need to be fixed by replacing the catch basin. Islands will be placed at tire store to define entrance and pedestrian way.
School: Driveway paving will be needed.

K. Gagne responded to questions and explained that two-lane roads will remain two-lane; no traffic signals will be introduced; and no street lighting is included in this phase. There was discussion over preferable means of crosswalk demarcation (paint vs. dissimilar building materials) but no conclusive recommendation was made. B. Muzzey asked about the variety of street trees to be added. K. Gagne thought that they would be red maples or new elms where elms had once existed.

General comments and discussion lead to the conclusion that the project is positive and the design has been sensitive to the culturally rich village. The impacts will not be considered "adverse". The impacts to historical properties require Section 4(f) compliance. NHDOT Bureau of Environment will send a blank Municipal Memo to FST. Consensus was reached that a de minimus impact finding sounds appropriate, therefore FST will complete the form and include for FHWA approval. (FHWA was not represented at the meeting.)

Alexandria, 14964 (no federal #). Participant: Evan Detrick (edetrick@dubois-king.com)**, Dubois and King.**

Evan Detrick, P.E. of DuBois & King, Inc. (D&K) presented the Washburn Road Bridge project. The bridge spans the Patten Brook, approximately 1.5 miles west of Alexandria Village. It is a single-lane bridge, comprised of steel stringers on cast in place concrete abutments with a wooden deck. It was constructed in 1950. Project construction will require an Army Corps permit.

Evan Detrick gave an overview of the current status of the project. D&K is currently completing an engineering study of the bridge, and is recommending that it be replaced with a new structure just downstream of the current structure. With the construction of the new bridge, the existing bridge would be completely demolished.

E. Detrick explained that during the course of the study, several alternatives were investigated, including:

- Replacing the existing bridge on its current alignment
- Replacing the existing bridge in two stages on an adjacent alignment
- Replacing the existing bridge in a single stage just downstream of the existing alignment

E. Detrick explained that the reasons for the recommendation to replace the bridge just downstream of the existing alignment included the need to provide two travel lanes across the bridge, the need to maintain traffic throughout construction, and costs.

The Cultural Resources Committee expressed concern about the potential archaeological impacts of constructing a new bridge just downstream of the existing bridge. They recommend that the town conduct a Phase 1A and 1B archaeological investigation performed, including background research and the excavation of test units.

The Cultural Resource Committee generally agreed that replacement seems to make sense, but was unable to evaluate eligibility of adjacent building concentration from the photographs. The Committee recommended that a historical consultant review the project setting to determine if realigning the road and bridge will have any adverse affect on the surrounding area. B. Muzzey requested a very short Project Area Form and an Individual Form Front for the bridge itself. However, if the town/D&K does not want to use a consultant, E. Detrick has the option of gathering the information in-house and presenting it at a future meeting. B. Muzzey expressed that the consultant route would probably be preferable. By reviewing this documentation, the Committee will determine whether the removal would potentially create a cultural resources impact.

The Committee also recommended that the archaeological and historical tasks be undertaken now, so that the town knows if constructing a new bridge on a new alignment is acceptable.

E. Detrick agreed to take this message to the Selectboard of Alexandria, and then let the Cultural Resources Committee know how the town will proceed.

Manchester (no state or federal #). Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD. [Future contact person: Heidi Marshall (HeidijM@cldengineers.com).]

Jamie Paine from CLD Consulting Engineers presented a conceptual plan for a proposed project from the City of Manchester to rehabilitate sidewalks and utilities through an existing warehouse district and a portion of Elm Street located west and south of the Verizon Wireless Arena. The intention of the project is to create a "gaslight" entertainment district that would provide various public amenities such as restaurants, commercial businesses, and a number of other uses. The project is currently being funded using city monies, but could consider state or federal funding if available. The project also has the potential to disturb over one acre of ground, requiring an EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II Construction General Permit Notice of Intent (NOI) to be filed, triggering a review for impacts to cultural resources under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

For this project, the city is preparing to reconstruct sidewalks, utilities, and other streetscape elements along Elm Street (and the adjacent blocks) between Granite and Valley Streets. This effort will set the tone and design standards for this part of the community for the foreseeable future.

ORNAMENTAL LIGHTS
Ornamental streetlights are expected to be installed, perhaps with a gaslight design.

COBBLES
A number of the streets within the existing warehouse district are cobble-lined, underneath top layers of asphalt. These cobbles would be collected and re-used as ornamental features in the area, either in street crossings or along the edge of proposed concrete sidewalks.

UTILITIES
Aboveground utility lines run throughout the area. The proposed project would refine and consolidate the locations of utilities to one side of roads as much as possible to clean up the aesthetics of the area and to create more space.

NHDHR DETERMINATION
NHDHR determined that the project area should be reviewed by a professional architectural historian to determine exactly which buildings are potentially eligible for the National Register. The historian should prepare a Project Area Form.

It was also determined, based on findings in the I-293 Exit 5 Reconstruction Project and other efforts in the area, that this portion of Manchester has a high likelihood to have deeply buried Native American resources. In addition, as some streets in this section are

cobble-lined, the cobbles may have covered over Native American sites with little disturbance and protected these resources, if present. NHDHR requested that a complete Phase I archaeological review of the project area be completed by a professional archaeologist.

Bedford (no state or federal #). Participant: Jeff Foote (jfoote@ci.bedford.nh.us), Town of Bedford.

J. Foote presented a municipally managed project from the Town of Bedford. The Town is proposing a realignment of the intersection at Gault Road and Liberty Hill Road to create a T-intersection. Wetland impacts trigger Section 106 review. B. Muzzey requested an individual inventory form done by a qualified architectural historian for the dwelling that the project proposes to remove. Additionally, a Phase 1A archaeological investigation for each alternative was requested.

Submitted by Sarah LeVaun Graulty and Joyce McKay
Cultural Resources, BOE